

Dear Henry and Sisal,

1/20/64

I have read the 95 pp. of Chapter X, made a few notes on it, will make a copy over the weekend, and will return it to Sisal. After she and I discuss any questions she may have, I'll also return the copy I make.

Under the existing conditions and time pressures I've made fewer notes than otherwise I would have. And of all the things in my mind about these pages I suppose the strongest single recommendation I would make is that Henry not associate himself as he does, rather strongly with the theories and alleged reporting of others. I believe no major changes would be required, little time, he would be saying the same things, but he would not be endorsing or vesting his own integrity and judgment in what I regard as at best dubious.

Delphine Roberts, for example, simply cannot be credited on anything, particularly not when she has given self-contradictory stories to various people over the years. Some interviewers are particularly adept at getting people to say what they want to hear. Others, for example, with Carolyn Arnold. The story she gave him is what he wanted, is inherently without credibility, is contradicted by her own earlier accounts, which happen to be both credible and supported, and as a result she cannot be credited in her first and I believe accurate story. The same is true of Newcomb's fairy tale that somehow, Henry does not in any way indicate how, Oswald believed that he was acting as an investigator for the Dodd committee. It also happens that unless there has been a major change in recent years, the Senate payroll is public and thus subject to checking, with the vouchers numbered so that any gaps are obvious. Likewise, although here Henry has a kind of disclaimer, the second Walters story, which I do not recall, has what cannot be believed built in, that DeBruyne appeared as a code on the Oswald informer records. Each contact with an informer is reported on a printed form in which the SA's name is not coded. While the informer is represented with a symbol, there is no code to the symbols that anyone could break. They are arbitrary symbols consisting of the initials of the field office, an initial representing the kind of informer and a number. Moreover, Oswald was not in H.O. long enough to become a real informer. At most he might have been a probationary informer. Probation lasts six months. Thus he might have had a number beginning with NO RH, and Walter would have known what the "P" meant.

In a few instances I have suggested minor deletions by means of which Henry can avoid personal endorsements while saying exactly the same thing. My concern in all these matters is for Henry and his later reputation and how he may feel about himself. Where it still will not require any great amount of time or work and I think is important is with such things as Oswald working for Banister. The same thing exactly can be said by absolutely rigidly straight reporting of what others have said, attributed and without evaluation that amounts to endorsement. (My own opinion is that these two and Ferris were of such strong beliefs that it is virtually impossible on that basis alone.)

Clinton is roughly NW from H.O., about 10 miles below the Miss. border. It is NE of Baton Rouge.

I think the suggestion that Garrison was protecting organized crime is quite unfair and without any reasonable basis. It also is unfair, as the note I made states, to allege that he drew attention to what was taken under search warrant from Shaw's home.

about Banister, you should understand, as I'm surprised Aaron John did not tell you, that Banister was known to have brain damage. I cannot imagine the FBI making any use of him for this and other reasons, one of which is that they never did those kinds of things that way. The name of their game is control.

With regard to Oswald in "Ferris's unit" of the GEP, it is probable, and I'd

a large file to be sure, that Ferrie was not officially in CIA at that time. However, when he was not in it officially he also was active in it unofficially. To avoid the possibility of inaccuracy and criticism for inaccuracy I suggest a slight change (X/52) line "Oswald as a teenager belonged to the same New Orleans unit of the Civil Air Patrol in which Ferrie had been active" or "was active."

Where you refer to "the small coffee shop" in the 544 camp building, it was more than a coffee shop (X55). Why not say instead "frequented James Hancock's cafe on the ground floor..." I take it that by the time Henry was there that building had been torn down, along with others, because he is a little uncertain about distances. The post office, properly Lafayette Square Post Office, was actually just across the street.

The ~~xxx~~ use of #5 in that building by the CRU was about a year earlier than the time you refer to on X70 and the CIA's support of the CRU ended 4/63.

Perhaps Hancock had some kind of explanation for Oswald believing that he was an investigator for the Dodd subcommittee but I do not recall its inclusion in this chapter, where I think it is necessary for Giff. I find it incredible.

I do not see how "the 1960 Hoover memo" (90) indicates "a possible relationship between Oswald and the FBI." Unless my recollection is faulty, as I indicate on 88, I do not believe the ~~xxx~~ memo is exactly as represented. I believe that Hoover was concerned (meaning those who wrote in his name) with the possible misuse of Oswald identification.

Best to you both,